UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/611,779	06/30/2003	Andrew J. Carroll	020431.1304	1881

53184   7590   10/28/2008

JDA Software Group, Inc.
ONE i2 PLACE, 11701 LUNA ROAD
DALLAS, TX 75234

EXAMINER
LEE, PHILIP C

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
2452	

MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
10/28/2008	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

PTOL-90A (Rev. 04/07)

	Application No.	Applicant(s)
Office Action Summary	10/611,779	CARROLL ET AL.
	Examiner	Art Unit
	PHILIP C. LEE	2452

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE *3* MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.
- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1)☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on *23 June 2008*.
2a)☐ This action is **FINAL**.   2b)☒ This action is non-final.
3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4)☒ Claim(s) *1-53* is/are pending in the application.
    4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
6)☒ Claim(s) *1-53* is/are rejected.
7)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
10)☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a)☐ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.
    Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
    Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
    a)☐ All   b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:
      1.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
      2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
      3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
    * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) ☐ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)
    Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.
4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
    Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ .
5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
6) ☐ Other: _____.

1.   This action is responsive to the amendment and remarks filed on June 23, 2008.

2.   Claims 1-53 are presented for examination.

3.   The text of those sections of Title 35, U.S. code not included in this office action can be

found in a prior office action.

Objection

4.   The specification is objected to as failing to provide proper antecedent basis for the

claimed subject matter. See 37 CFR 1.75(d)(1) and MPEP § 608.01(o). Correction of the

following is required: computer-readable media.

Claim Rejections – 35 USC 102

5.   Claims 1-2, 10-12, 18-19, 27-29, 35-36, 44-46 and 52 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e)

as being anticipated by Jayaram et al, U.S. Patent 6,996,589 (hereinafter Jayaram).

6.   Jayaram was cited in the previous office action.

7.   As per claims 1, 18, 35 and 52, Jayaram teaches the invention as claimed comprising:

a data integration server coupled to one or more persistent data stores (system with the

database conversion engine connected to the source database and target database)(fig. 1;

col. 3, lines 33-52; col. 10, lines 56-63),

the data integration server comprising:

a plurality of programmatic source interfaces (234, fig. 2, data filters with source extract

format specification; col. 14, lines 20-22), each being associated with a corresponding

source data store (associated with source system 320, 225 of fig. 2), defined according to

a common programmatic source interface specification (defined according to source

extract format specification)(col. 11, lines 1-5), and exposed within the data integration

server during a bulk data transfer (abstract) in connection with an enterprise-level

business workflow (abstract; col. 16, lines 1-12) to enable the data integration server to

extract from the corresponding source data store one or more data entities for loading into

any one or more selected target data stores during the bulk data transfer (data filters used

during bulk transfer to enable the system to receive/pull source data for loading into the

target system)(col. 11, lines 5-11; col. 11, line 64-col. 12, line 10); and

a plurality of programmatic target interfaces (270, fig. 2, data upload process consists of

tools such as SQL loader (sqlldr; col. 18, lines 56-61) with target scheme specification

and mapping specification), each being associated with a corresponding target data store

(associated with target system 310, fig. 2), defined according to a common programmatic

target interface specification (defined according to target scheme specification and

mapping specification)(col. 11, lines 5-11), and exposed within the data integration server

during a bulk data transfer in connection with an enterprise-level business workflow

(abstract) to enable the data integration server to load into the corresponding target data store one or more data entities extracted from any one or more selected source data stores during the bulk data transfer (data upload used during bulk transfer to enable the system to upload the source data to the target system)(col. 11, lines 5-11; col. 12, lines 31-34); wherein each of the plurality of programmatic source interfaces and the plurality of programmatic target interfaces is operable to:

provide to the corresponding source data store and the corresponding target data store an abstraction of bulk data transfer operations within the data integration server such that custom code need not be developed in connection with the corresponding source data store and the corresponding target data store to enable bulk data transfers between the corresponding source data store and the corresponding target data store (col. 12, lines 35-38)(system with conversion engine perform bulk data transfer between databases using source extract format specification, target scheme specification and mapping specification without the need for code changes to enable transfer); and

isolate from the data integration server specific details associated with the corresponding source data store and the corresponding target data store such that custom code need not be developed in connection with the data integration server to enable bulk data transfers between the corresponding source data store and the corresponding target data store (col. 12, lines 35-38; col. 16, lines 42-52)(the mapping specification isolates the rules relating to the conversion of the source system to the target system from the database conversion engine without the need for code changes to enable tansfer).

8.   As per claims 2, 19, and 36, Jayaram teaches the invention as claimed in claims 1, 18,

and 35 above. Jayaram further teach the data integration server is operable to expose its bulk

data transfer operations as services to applications or other systems (col. 10, lines 42-49) (bulk

data conversion and transfer is performed for the source system and target system)within an

enterprise-level infrastructure (e.g., billing industry or telecom industry infrastructure) and to

execute a bulk data transfer operation in response to a request from such an application or other

system (col. 10, lines 58-63) (instructions such as scheduling instructions for performing the

conversion and transfer).

9.   As per claims 10, 27, and 44, Jayaram teaches the invention as claimed in claims 1, 18,

and 35 above. Jayaram further teach a particular data store may be a source data store or a target

data store for a particular bulk data transfer depending on whether data entities are extracted

from the particular data store or loaded into the particular data store during the particular bulk

data transfer (inherent in col. 2, lines 15-20) (system may be source or target depending on

whether information is from (i.e., extracted) one system into (i.e., loaded) into another system).

10.   As per claims 11, 28, and 45, Jayaram teaches the invention as claimed in claims 1, 18,

and 35 above. Jayaram further teach loading data entities comprises inserting, updating, or

deleting data entities (col. 11, lines 1-11) (uploading data must comprises inserting data into a

target system).

11.   As per claims 12, 29, and 46, Jayaram teaches the invention as claimed in claims 1, 18,

and 35 above. Jayaram further teach wherein each of the plurality of programmatic source

interfaces and the plurality of programmatic target interfaces comprise: one or more resources

representing data entities contained in the corresponding data store are defined (col. 14, lines 18-

22) (data filter and data upload comprise source extract format specification, mapping

specification and target scheme specification, representing the format of data); and the data

integration server is operable to, in response to a request to execute a bulk data transfer involving

one or more resources contained in one or more data stores (col. 10, lines 56-63) (instructions

served to the system for executing of schedule conversion and uploading must include request to

execute), create each programmatic interface within which at least one of the resources is defined

(in response to conversion, generate source extract format specification within which format is

defined) (col. 14, lines 26-28).

Claim Rejections – 35 USC 103

12.   Claims 16-17, 33-34, 50-51 and 53 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being

unpatentable over Jayaram.

13.   As per claims 16, 33, and 50, although Jayaram teaches one or more transformation

interfaces exposed within the data integration server (col. 10, lines 64-67), each transformation

interface: comprising one or more programmatic interfaces defined within the transformation

interface (col. 16, lines 24-26); comprising custom transformation logic to be applied to data

entities extracted from one or more source data stores in a bulk data transfer, using one or more

of the corresponding plurality of programmatic source interfaces (col. 16, lines 30-41), before the

extracted data entities are loaded into one or more target data stores in the bulk data transfer,

using one or more of the corresponding plurality of programmatic target interfaces (col. 16, lines

30-41); and the data integration server is further operable to, in connection with creating the

programmatic interfaces, create each transformation interface within which at least one of the

programmatic interfaces is defined for application of the associated custom transformation logic

in the bulk data transfer (col. 16, lines 24-41), however, Jayaram does not specifically teach

isolating transformation logic from defined programmatic interfaces. It would have been

obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention was made that the

transformation logic can be coded separately from logical relationship (i.e., programmatic

interfaces) because by doing so it would be easier to develop separate segments of codes in a

complex software system.

14.   As per claims 17, 34, and 51, Jayaram teaches the invention as claimed in claim 16, 33,

and 50 above. Jayaram further teach a controller (inherently comprised) supported within the

data integration server and operable to use a transformation interface in executing an individual

bulk data transfer without using a commercially available Extract-Transform-Load (ETL) tool in

connection with the bulk data transfer (col. 10, lines 24-67) (note that ETL is not used in the

conversion engine).

15.   As per claim 53, it is rejected for the same reason as claims 1, 2, 16, and 17 above.

16.   Claims 3, 20 and 37 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over

Jayaram in view of Shannon et al, U.S. Patent Application Publication 2002/0046301

(hereinafter Shannon).

17.   Shannon was cited in the previous office action.

18.   As per claims 3, 20, and 37, Jayaram does not teach Java interfaces. Shannon teaches

Java interfaces ([0031] and claim 5).

19.   Because Jayaram and Shannon teach similar method of interfacing systems for data

transfer, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time of the

invention was made to use known technique of JAVA interface of Shannon's system to improve

similar method of interfacing systems for data transfer in Jayaram's system in the same way. By

using the known technique of JAVA interface, it would allow Jayaram's system to map

transferred data between the systems.

20.   Claims 4-6, 8, 21-23, 25, 38-40 and 42 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being

unpatentable over Jayaram in view of Casagrande et al, U.S. Patent 6,381,709 (hereinafter

Casagrande).

21.   Casagrande was cited in the previous office action.

22.   As per claims 4, 21, and 38, Jayaram teaches the invention as claimed in claim 1 above.

Although Jayaram teaches a programmatic interface may be exposed within the data integration

server supporting bulk data transfers (col. 11, lines 1-5); and the data integration server is

operable to: create the corresponding programmatic interface to enable extraction of the data

from or loading of the data into the data store (col. 14, lines 26-28); and for data extraction, as

the programmatic source interface produces the data extracted from the data store, send the

outgoing data; or for data loading, as the data arrives, send the incoming data to the

programmatic target interface for loading into the data store (col. 11, lines 1-11), however,

Jayaram does not teach industry standard interface and industry standard protocol. Casagrande

teaches an interface supporting data transfer according to an industry standard protocol (fig. 4,

col. 8, lines 60-67); receive a request from a client indicating that the client is extracting data

from or loading data into a data store in accordance with the industry standard protocol (col. 3,

lines 48-51); and send the outgoing data to the client in accordance with the industry standard

protocol (col. 3, lines 1-4).

23.   Because both Jayaram and Casagrande teach similar method of interfacing systems for

data transfer, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time of the

invention was made to use known technique of FTP interface of transferring data in Casagrande's

system to improve similar method of interfacing systems for data transfer in Jayaram's system in

the same way. By using the known technique of FTP interface, it would allow Jayaram's system

to exchange data between systems on a network.

24.   As per claims 5, 22, and 39, Jayaram and Casagrande teach the invention substantially as

claimed in claims 4, 21, and 38 above. Jayaram further teach the data integration server allows a

client supporting an industry standard protocol for bulk data transfers to perform bulk data

transfers with respect to an existing data store using a programmatic interface whether or not the

existing data store or an associated existing application itself supports bulk data transfers in

accordance with the industry standard protocol (col. 10, lines 43-63; col. 11, lines 23-27).

25.   As per claims 6, 23, and 40, Jayaram teaches the invention as claimed in claim 1 above.

Although Jayaram teaches a programmatic source interface may be exposed within the data

integration server supporting bulk data transfers (col. 11, lines 1-5); and the data integration

server is operable to: create the programmatic source interface to enable extraction of the data

from the corresponding source data store (col. 14, lines 26-28); and as the programmatic source

interface produces the data extracted from the corresponding source data store, send the outgoing

data (col. 11, lines 1-11), however, Jayaram does not teach industry standard File Transfer

Protocol (FTP) interface and FTP industry standard protocol. Casagrande teaches a FTP

interface supporting data transfer according to an FTP industry standard protocol (fig. 4, col. 8,

lines 60-67); and allow an FTP client to open an FTP connection informing the data integration

server that the FTP client is downloading a stream of data from the corresponding source data

store (col. 6, lines 10-15; col. 9, lines 58-60); and as the interface produces the stream of data

extracted from the corresponding source data store, send the outgoing stream of data to the FTP

client in accordance with FTP (fig. 4, col. 3, lines 1-4).

26.   Because both Jayaram and Casagrande teach similar method of interfacing systems for

data transfer, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time of the

invention was made to use known technique of FTP interface of transferring data in Casagrande's

system to improve similar method of interfacing systems for data transfer in Jayaram's system in

the same way. By using the known technique of FTP interface, it would allow Jayaram's system

to exchange data between systems on a network.

27.   As per claims 8, 25, and 42, Jayaram teaches the invention as claimed in claim 1 above.

Although Jayaram teaches a programmatic source interface may be exposed within the data

integration server supporting bulk data transfers (col. 11, lines 1-5); and the data integration

server is operable to: create the programmatic source interface to enable loading of the data into

the corresponding source data store (col. 14, lines 26-28); and as the data arrives, send the

incoming data to the programmatic target interface for loading into the corresponding target data

store (col. 11, lines 1-11), however, Jayaram does not teach industry standard File Transfer

Protocol (FTP) interface and FTP industry standard protocol. Casagrande teaches a FTP

interface supporting data transfer according to an FTP industry standard protocol (fig. 4, col. 8,

lines 60-67); and allow an FTP client to open an FTP connection informing the data integration

server that the FTP client is uploading a stream of data to the corresponding target data store

(col. 6, lines 10-15; col. 9, lines 58-60); and as the stream of data arrives from the FTP client in

accordance with FTP, send the outgoing stream of data into the data store (fig. 4, col. 3, lines 1-

4) (i.e., the server of fig. 4 is interpreted as the FTP client and FTP client 12 and 24 of fig. 4 is

the interpreted as the data store).

28.   Because both Jayaram and Casagrande teach similar method of interfacing systems for

data transfer, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time of the

invention was made to use known technique of FTP interface of transferring data in Casagrande's

system to improve similar method of interfacing systems for data transfer in Jayaram's system in

the same way. By using the known technique of FTP interface, it would allow Jayaram's system

to exchange data between systems on a network.

29.   Claims 13-15, 30-32 and 47-49 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable

over Jayaram in view of Walsh et al, U.S. Patent Application Publication 2003/0233249

(hereinafter Walsh).

30.   Walsh was cited in the previous office action.

31.   As per claims 13, 30, and 47, Jayaram teaches the invention as claimed in claims 1, 18,

and 35 above. Although Jayaram teach connect to data stores (fig. 1), whether or not the tool is

compatible with these data stores, using the corresponding programmatic interfaces to extract

data entities from and load data entities into these data stores (col. 11, lines 1-11), however,

Jayaram does not teach ETL tool. Walsh teaches connect directly to data stores (fig. 1) with

which the ETL tool is compatible to extract data entities directly from and load data entities

directly into these data stores ([0092]).

32.   Because both Jayaram and Walsh teach similar method of interfacing systems for data

transfer, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time of the

invention was made to use known technique of ETL tool of transferring data in Walsh's system

to improve similar method of interfacing systems for data transfer in Jayaram's system in the

same way. By using the known technique of ETL tool, it would allow Jayaram's system to

exchange data between systems on a network.

33.   As per claims 14, 31, and 48, Jayaram and Walsh teach the invention as claimed in

claims 13, 30, and 47 above. Although Jayaram teach the data integration server is operable to

use programmatic interfaces to support compatibility between any corresponding data store (col.

2, lines 56-60), however, Jayaram and Walsh do not teach to support compatibility between any

commercially available ETL tool. It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the

art at the time of the invention was made to support ETL tool or any type of tools for the data

stores in order to provide a data store independent system allowing data conversion from any

source data stores into any target data stores.

34.   As per claims 15, 32, and 49, Jayaram and Walsh teach the invention as claimed in

claims 14, 31, and 48 above. Jayaram further teach the data integration server supports a

controller operable to execute individual bulk data transfers using programmatic interfaces where

either: an Extract-Transform-Load (ETL) tool is not present (col. 3, lines 16-24) (i.e., ETL is not

present in the conversion engine); or an ETL tool is present but its capabilities are not needed to

transform data entities extracted from one or more source data stores, using one or more of the

corresponding plurality of programmatic source interfaces, before the extracted data entities are

loaded into one or more target data stores, using one or more of the corresponding plurality of

programmatic target interfaces, because physical database schemas of the source and target data

stores are at least substantially similar.

35.   Claims 7, 9, 24, 26, 41, and 43 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable

over Jayaram and Casagrande in view of Walsh.

36.   As per claims 7, 9, 24, 26, 41, and 43, Jayaram and Casagrande teach the invention

substantially as claimed in claims 6, 8, 23, 25, 40, and 42 above. Jayaram and Casagrande do not

teach Extract-Transform-Load (ETL) tool. Walsh teaches a commercially available Extract-

Transform-Load (ETL) tool supported within the data integration server ([0089], [0092]).

37.   Because Jayaram, Casagrande and Walsh teach similar method of interfacing systems for

data transfer, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time of the

invention was made to use known technique of ETL tool of transferring data in Walsh's system

to improve similar method of interfacing systems for data transfer in Jayaram's and Casagrande's

systems in the same way. By using the known technique of ETL tool, it would allow Jayaram's

and Casagrande's systems to exchange data between systems on a network.

38.   Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 1-53, filed 6/23/08, have been fully

considered but they are not persuasive.

39.   In the remark, applicant argued that:

(1)   The objection under 37 DFR 1.75(d)(1) should be withdrawn.

(2)   Claim 52 is directed to statutory subject matter.

(3)   Jayaram fails to teach computer-implemented system for executing

bulk data transfers between persistent data stores in connection with an

enterprise-level business workflow.

(4)   Jayaram fails to teach data integration server coupled to one or

more persistent data stores and the data integration server comprising

plurality of programmatic source interfaces and a plurality of

programmatic target interfaces.

(5)   Jayaram fails to teach a plurality of programmatic source

interfaces, each being associated with a corresponding source data store,

defined according to a common programmatic source interface

specification, and exposed within the data integration server during a bulk

data transfer in connection with an enterprises-level business workflow to

enable the data integration server to extract from the corresponding source

data store one or more data entities for loading into any one or more

selected target data stores during the bulk data transfer and a plurality of

programmatic target interfaces, each being associated with a

corresponding target data store, defined according to a common

programmatic target interface specification, and exposed within the data

integration server during the bulk data transfer in connection with an

enterprise-level business workflow to enable the data integration server to

load into the corresponding target data store the one or more data entities

extracted from any one or more selected sourced data stores during the

bulk data transfer in connection with an enterprise-level business

workflow to enable the data integration server to load into the

corresponding target data store the one or more data entities extracted

from any one or more selected source data stores during the bulk data

transfer.

(6)   office action fails to establish a prima facie case of anticipation

over in claims 1, 2, 10-12, 18-19, 27-29, 35-36, 44-46 and 52 under 35

USC 102 with respect to Jayaram because Jayaram fails to provide concise

explanation to identically disclose each and every element of the claimed

invention.

(7)   Office action fails to establish a prima facie case of obviousness

based on the "Examination Guidelines for Determining Obviousness

Under 35 USC 103 in view of the Supreme Court Decision in *KSR*

International Co. v. Teleflex Inc."

(8)   Office action fails to provide an indication of the level of ordinary

skill.

(9)   Office action fails to explain why the difference between the

combination of Jayaram, Shannon, Casagrande, Walsh, and the claimed

invention would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art.

40.   In response to point (1), 608.01(o) of the MPEP states: " While an applicant is

not limited to the nomenclature used in the application as filed, he or she should make

appropriate amendment of the specification whenever this nomenclature is departed from

by amendment of the claims so as to have clear support or antecedent basis in the

specification for the new terms appearing in the claims. This is necessary in order to

insure certainty in construing the claims in the light of the specification, Ex parte Kotler,

1901 C.D. 62, 95 O.G. 2684 (Comm'r Pat. 1901). See 37 CFR 1.75, MPEP §

608.01(i) and § 1302.01. …If the examiner determines that the claims presented late in

prosecution do not comply with 37 CFR 1.75(d)(1), applicant will be required to make

appropriate amendment to the description to provide clear support or antecedent basis for the

terms appearing in the claims provided no new matter is introduced." In this instance, the term

"computer-readable media" does not comply with 37 CFR 1.75(d)(1), applicant is required to

make appropriate amendment to the description to provide clear support or antecedent basis for

this term provided no new matter is introduced.

41.   In response to point (2), the amendment of claim 52 filed on 6/23/08 includes a

computer-implemented system…, comprising a data integration server, which is a hardware

structure according to page 12, line 30 and fig. 1 of the specification. Accordingly, the rejection

under 35 USC 101 of claim 52 is withdrawn.

42.   In response to point (3), applicant's arguments, the recitation "a computer-implemented

system for executing bulk data transfers between persistent data stores in connection with an

enterprise-level business workflow" has not been given patentable weight because the recitation

occurs in the preamble. A preamble is generally not accorded any patentable weight where it

merely recites the purpose of a process or the intended use of a structure, and where the body of

the claim does not depend on the preamble for completeness but, instead, the process steps or

structural limitations are able to stand alone. See *In re Hirao*, 535 F.2d 67, 190 USPQ 15

(CCPA 1976) and *Kropa v. Robie*, 187 F.2d 150, 152, 88 USPQ 478, 481 (CCPA 1951).

Although the argued limitation has not been given patentable weight, it is noted that Jayaram

does teach a system for executing bulk data transfers between persistent data stores (col. 1, lines

6-9) in connection with an enterprise-level (e.g., billing industry or telecom industry) business

workflow (flow of business information such customer information between 320 and 310 of

figure 3; abstract; col. 16, lines 1-12; col. 13, lines 6-8).

43.   In response to point (4), Jayaram teaches a computer system with the data conversion

engine, which receive/pull source data (source data store) and upload resulting source data to

target database (target data store) (fig. 1; col. 3, lines 33-52; col. 10, lines 56-63) (i.e., a data

integration server coupled to one or more persistent data stores). As shown in figure 2, the

computer system comprises data conversion engine 250, data filters 234 (col. 14, lines 20-22)

and data upload 270 (i.e., the data integration server comprises plurality of programmatic source

interface (data filters, 234; col. 14, lines 20-22) and plurality of programmatic target interface

(data upload process consists of tools (e.g., sql loaders), 270) (col. 18, lines 56-61)

44.   In response to point (5), Jayaram teaches source interfaces (234, data filters with source

extract format specification; col. 14, lines 20-22), each being associated with a corresponding

source data store (associated with source system 320, 225 of fig. 2), defined according to a

common programmatic source interface specification (defined according to source extract format

specification, col. 11, lines 1-5), and exposed within the data integration server during a bulk

data transfer (abstract; col. 1, lines 6-9) in connection with an enterprise-level business workflow

(enterprise-level (e.g., such as billing industry or telecom industry) flow of business data

between systems 320 and 310, fig. 3; abstract) to enable the data integration server to extract

from the corresponding source data store one or more data entities for loading into any one or

more selected target data stores during the bulk data transfer (data filters used during bulk

transfer to enable the system to receive/pull source data for loading into the target system)(col.

11, lines 5-11; col. 11, line 64-col. 12, line 10). Jayaram further teach target interfaces (270, fig.

2, data upload process consists of tools such as SQL loader (sqlldr; col. 18, lines 56-61) with

target scheme specification and mapping specification), each being associated with a

corresponding target data store (associated with target system, 310 of fig. 2), defined according

to a common programmatic target interface specification (defined according to target scheme

specification and mapping specification)(col. 11, lines 5-11), and exposed within the data

integration server during the bulk data transfer (abstract; col. 1, lines 6-9) in connection with an

enterprise-level business workflow (enterprise-level (e.g., such as billing industry or telecom

industry) flow of business data between systems 320 and 310, fig. 3; abstract) to enable the data

integration server to load into the corresponding target data store the one or more data entities

extracted from any one or more selected sourced data stores during the bulk data transfer in

connection with an enterprise-level business workflow to enable the data integration server to

load into the corresponding target data store the one or more data entities extracted from any one

or more selected source data stores during the bulk data transfer (data upload process consists of

tools (e.g., sql loader) used during bulk transfer to enable the system to upload the source data to

the target system)(col. 11, lines 5-11; col. 12, lines 31-34).

45.   In response to point (6), the rejections set forth above provide more concise explanation

for the claim limitation. Hence, applicant argument is moot in view of the concise explanation

set forth above.

46.   In response to points (7)-(8), the rejections set forth above provide the factual findings

and rationale for obviousness based on Court Decision in *KSR International Co. v. Teleflex Inc,*

which include an indication of the level of ordinary skill.. Hence, applicant argument is moot in

view of the factual findings and the rationales set forth above.

47.   In response to points (9), the rejections set forth above provide rationale for obviousness

based on Court Decision in *KSR International Co. v. Teleflex Inc,* which include explanation of

the difference between the combination of Jayaram, Shannon, Casagrande, Walsh, and the

claimed invention would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art. Hence, applicant

argument is moot in view of the rationales set forth above. In response to applicant's argument

that the examiner's conclusion of obviousness is based upon improper hindsight reasoning, it

must be recognized that any judgment on obviousness is in a sense necessarily a reconstruction

based upon hindsight reasoning. But so long as it takes into account only knowledge which was

within the level of ordinary skill at the time the claimed invention was made, and does not

include knowledge gleaned only from the applicant's disclosure, such a reconstruction is proper.

See *In re McLaughlin*, 443 F.2d 1392, 170 USPQ 209 (CCPA 1971).

48.   A shortened statutory period for reply to this Office action is set to expire THREE

MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. Any inquiry concerning this communication or

earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Philip C Lee whose telephone

number is (571)272-3967. The examiner can normally be reached on 8 AM TO 5:30 PM

Monday to Thursday and every other Friday. If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are

unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, John Follansbee can be reached on (571) 272-3964.

The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is

571-273-8300. Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the

Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published

applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for

unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about

the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the

Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

/Philip C Lee/

Patent Examiner, Art Unit 2452